

### REMARKS

In response to the office action dated on May 13, 2008, Applicant amended the abstract and claims 1 and 9. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 9 can be found, e.g., on page 2, lines 3-14 of the specification. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

The Examiner objected to the abstract on the ground that it is too short. Applicant amended the abstract to obviate this objection, so the objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 as under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over, six references.<sup>1</sup> As amended, claims 1-20 cover articles containing a photovoltaically active polymeric compound. None of the six cited references, either alone or in any combination, discloses or renders obvious such an article. It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner to provide the articles covered by claims 1-20, and, even if that person did somehow make the Examiner's combination, the result would not be the articles covered by these claims.

The Examiner asserts that "it is well known in the photovoltaic art to utilize a polymer solar cell (photovoltaic conversion device containing polymer therein, see abstract and example 1 on Col. 33 [of Nakamura]) to increase the conversion efficiently and also the flexibility as taught by Nakamura (See also Col. 6, lines 4-21)." *See* the office action, page 5, lines 3-6. However, Applicants see no support for this statement in Nakamura because this reference simply does not disclose or render obvious such subject matter. Instead, Nakamura discloses in Example 1 on columns 33 and 34 a photovoltaic cell in which the photovoltaically active compound is a dye-sensitized TiO<sub>2</sub>, which includes an inorganic semiconductor, not a photovoltaic active polymeric compound.<sup>2</sup> Further, the polymers mentioned at column 6, lines 4-21 in Nakamura are used merely as a support for conductive metal oxides. In other words, these polymers are not photovoltaically active. Thus, Nakamura does not disclose or render

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 14, and 18 under 35. U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by Ou, U.S. Application 2002/0088863 ("Ou"). Applicant does not concede that Ou is a 102(b) reference. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant amended independent claims 1 and 9 to obviate this rejection.

<sup>2</sup> See also column 4, line 19 to column 5, line 51 regarding the inorganic semiconductors that can be used in the photovoltaic cells disclosed in Nakamura.

Applicant : Christoph Brabec  
Serial No. : 10/522,862  
Filed : September 6, 2005  
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 21928-005US1  
Client's Docket No.: SA-4

obvious articles containing a photovoltaically active polymeric compound, as required by amended claims 1-20. Nor does the other five references.

For at least the reasons set forth above, amended claims 1-20 are not anticipated by or obvious over the six cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, an action of which is requested.

Please apply any charges to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney's Docket No. 21928-005US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 19, 2008

/Tony Zhang/  
Tony Zhang, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. L0256

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Citigroup Center - 52nd Floor  
153 East 53rd Street  
New York, New York 10022-4611  
Telephone: (212) 765-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945